

**REMARKS**

By the foregoing Amendment, it is believed that the remaining claims in this application are allowable in view of the interview so courteously granted to Applicant's attorney by Examiner Price on July 10, 1998.

The specification has been amended to more clearly describe the function of ribs 24 when an animal bites down on the toy along wider groove 27 which causes certain ribs 24 to engaged the sides of the teeth while other adjacent ribs massage the gums. There should be no issue of new matter since the amendment to the specification merely describes what was shown in the application as filed.

A Request for Approval of Drawing Changes is enclosed. This proposes to add reference numerals "26" and "27" in the various drawing figures to correspond to the reference numerals in the specification. Therefore, approval of these changes is respectfully requested.

Newly added Claim 16 is an independent claim drawn to the features which were indicated as allowable in the interview. This claim, however, omits the limitations of original Claim 1 which are not deemed necessary for patentability. Claim 16 specifically sets forth the arrangement of the pairs of ribs 24 with narrow groove 26 formed by each pair of ribs and wider groove 27 between the pairs of ribs to perform the dual function of cleaning the teeth with the innermost ribs with respect to wider groove 27 and massaging the gums with the outermost ribs. This occurs when the animal bites down on wider groove 27 to deflect the side wall of the toy in area 42. It was understood at the interview that this defined structure is patentable over the prior art. Therefore, allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.



Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 9, 10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markham in view of Shipp is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended to depend from new Claim 16. Claim 1 sets forth the particular structure of the pet toy and is allowable for the same reasons as Claim 16 from which it depends. Therefore, Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 9 and 10 each depend from Claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, Claims 9 and 10 should be allowed.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of new Claim 16. Therefore, Claim 12 should be allowed.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 12. Therefore, Claim 13 should be allowed.

The previous allowance of Claims 5-8 is noted with appreciation. Each of these claims has been amended to be an independent claim containing all of the limitations of original Claim 1 from which it originally depended. Therefore, these claims should still be allowable.

A sincere effort has been made to place this application into condition for allowance. Therefore, favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FIELDS & JOHNSON, P.C.



Gary D. Fields  
Brent P. Johnson  
8481 East Orchard Avenue, Suite 5600  
Englewood, CO 80111  
(303) 689-9100

Date: 31 July 1998